



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: MICHAEL S. TIGNOR et al.)
Serial No: 09/660,876) Group Art Unit:
Filed: September 13, 2000) 2836
For: WORLD WIDE WEB ENABLED AND DIGITAL) Examiner:
RATING PLUG) Danny Nguyen

#6 / Elect
T. BELL
12-9-02

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800
RECEIVED
DEC -5 2002

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

SPECIES ELECTION RESPONSE

Sir:

The Examiner has required that Applicants elect from one of the following species: Species 1 (FIGS. 3 and 5), Species 2 (FIG. 4), Species 3 (FIG. 6), and Species 4 (remote altering rating plug operation).

During a telephone interview with Examiner Danny Nguyen on Friday November 1, 2002, the undersigned questioned the distinction between Species 1 and Species 3 since the rating plug 125 shown in FIG. 6 is the same rating plug 125 used in the circuit breaker shown in FIG. 5. FIG. 6 does not show a different embodiment of a rating plug than what is used within FIG. 5, and therefore should not constitute a separate species.

With the above in mind, *Applicant respectfully elects, with traverse, Species 1. The claims which are readable on Species 1 include Claims 1-5, 16-26, and 37-39.* As argued above, "Species 3" is the rating plug used in FIG. 5 (Species 1), and therefore should also be included in this election. Since FIGS. 5 and 6 are intertwined even within the claims, e.g. Claim 23 recites both the circuit breaker (FIG. 5) and the digital rating plug (FIGS. 5 and 6 item 125), it is respectfully submitted that Species 1 and 3 need to be combined and that Claims 1-5, 16-26, and 37-39 be examined together.

Further, during the November 1, 2002 telephone conversation, the undersigned questioned the distinction between Species 2 and 4. The Examiner indicated that the "remote altering rating plug operation" is not shown for Species 4, however, it is respectfully submitted that FIG. 4 clearly depicts how rating information may be